

CALLINICUS

A DEFENCE OF CHEMICAL WARFARE

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

*For the Contents of this Series see the end
of the Book.*

CALLINICUS

Defence of Chemical Warfare

BY

J. B. S. HALDANE

*Sir William Dunn Reader in Biochemistry,
Cambridge University*

LONDON: .

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO. LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE: 68-74, CARTER LANE, E.C.

1925

First Edition: January 1925.

Second Edition: May 1925.

Printed in Great Britain by

MACKAYS LTD., CHATHAM.

PREFACE

This lecture was delivered in Mürren in August, 1924, on behalf of Sir Henry Lunn. It is reprinted almost as delivered, except that a few references to individuals have, I hope, been adequately disguised. If the Rt. Hon. A, Gen. B, and Prof. C made fools of themselves, they were not unique in this respect, and I have no desire to single them out.

In a discussion which followed the lecture Mr. L. S. Amery, M.P., pointed out that chemical warfare would be relatively unimportant in a war of the South African type, between small numbers on large fronts. This is of course true, but it is questionable whether we are likely to be engaged in many really important wars of this type

in the near future. I have made no reference to the use of chemical weapons in naval warfare, as I know too little of such matters for my opinions to be worth recording.

Most of the facts here set forth ~~may~~ be found in the official medical history of the war. I am publishing this book because I believe that a moral can be drawn from them.

“Callinicus” means “He who conquers in a noble or beautiful manner.”

CALLINICUS

THE public mind has to a large extent reacted against the opinions impressed on it during the War by official propaganda. Some of these have been overcome by counter-propaganda in the Press and on the platform ; others have been dropped because they led to effects which, though admirable during a war, were undesirable in peace-time. But, as chemical warfare will not assume importance until the outbreak of the next serious war, and figures on the programme of no party, people still think about it as they were told to think by the newspapers during the Great War.

Now, I am to some extent a chemist,

CALLINICUS

so I can no more be expected to be impartial in my estimate of the value of chemistry than a politician or a clergyman can be expected to give an unbiased view of the value of politics or religion. I can only plead that, unlike the average clergyman or politician, I have warned my audience in advance, and shall attempt (though no doubt vainly) to be impartial.

A few of my hearers hold the view that, while war in itself is a noble occupation, the use of poisonous gas is an innovation as cruel as it is unsoldierly. The majority are probably pacifists in the sense that they prefer almost any peace to almost any war, support the League of Nations or other devices for the prevention of international strife, and look askance at preparations for

CHEMICAL WARFARE

future warfare, more particularly for future chemical warfare. If so, I certainly share their objection to war, but I doubt whether by objecting to it we are likely to avoid it in future, however lofty our motives or disinterested our conduct. War will be prevented only by a scientific study of its causes, such as has prevented most epidemic diseases. For many centuries people had guessed that epidemic diseases constituted a punishment for human misconduct of some kind. They tried to prevent them by prayer and almsgiving. Christians gave up washing, Hindus liberated rats captured during plague-epidemics. Religious orders and priests of the Church gave the most magnificent examples of self-sacrifice in times of pestilence. But that was not the way

CALLINICUS

in which pestilences can be prevented. Besides good intentions, a special type of accurate thinking was needed. We have not yet made a scientific study of the causes of war, and, until we do, may expect more wars. If we are to have more wars, I prefer that my country should be on the winning side. That is why I am speaking on warfare to my fellow-countrymen.

In general, pacifists are a very great military advantage to Britain. On the outbreak of war the large majority of them become intensely patriotic, whereas beforehand they lead our own military authorities and also those of our potential allies and enemies to underestimate our strength. This keeps us out of some wars, and leads to our showing unsuspected power in others.

CHEMICAL WARFARE

After a few years of war, when the originally bellicose politicians like Lord Lansdowne are getting tired, expacifists like Lloyd George and Pitt have just got into their stride. The national staying-power is thus greatly increased. I need hardly remark that future governments will not enter on war without first persuading the vast majority of the people of its justice. This appears to be a relatively simple process under modern conditions.

At the present moment, however, pacifists are combining with the less competent soldiers in an attempt to check the progress of chemical warfare. This I believe to be neither in our national nor in the international interest.

Until 1915 the soldier's business was

CALLINICUS

to push or throw pieces of metal at the enemy. Various devices had been employed for throwing them fast or far, and some of them threw other pieces on arrival at their destination, thanks, in the main, to the genius of the unforgotten Major-General Shrapnel. It is true that early in the eighth century A.D. the appropriately named Syrian Callinicus had prolonged the life of the Eastern Roman Empire for another 750 years and saved a large part of Christendom from Mahomedan domination by his invention of "Greek fire," an inflammable liquid which was, however, later superseded by gunpowder. In the fifteenth century the defenders of Belgrade against the Turks had hit upon a similar device, under the direct inspiration, it was claimed, of the

CHEMICAL WARFARE

Holy Ghost, but these weapons had fallen into desuetude, their effect being largely psychological.

Chemical warfare had been so far foreseen by statesmen that in 1907 the signatories of the Hague Conference agreed to renounce the use of projectiles the sole object of which was the diffusion of asphyxiating or harmful gases. They were thus debarred from using lachrymatory gas, the most humane weapon ever invented ; but permitted to discharge gas from cylinders on the ground, an exceedingly cruel practice. This regulation was well meant, but the path to August, 1914, was paved with good intentions. In 1914 none of the great powers had made any preparation for poison-gas warfare, and it was not till April 22nd, 1915, more than eight

CALLINICUS

months after the beginning of the war, that the Germans began its use.

During the war, twenty-five different poisonous weapons were employed. Of these only three are gases at ordinary temperatures, and can be discharged from cylinders in which they are stored under pressure. The remainder are liquids which gradually evaporate, yielding a poisonous vapour, or solids which are poisonous in the form of smoke.

These poisonous substances so far used fall into four classes according to their effect on men. First come gases and vapours which are poisonous when breathed, but have no effect on the skin, and affect the eyes or nose only when present in concentrations which are poisonous to the lungs. They can all be kept out by respirators, and were

CHEMICAL WARFARE

of military value only against unprotected troops, or in local surprise-action. This group, which included chlorine and phosgene, are probably almost as obsolete as muzzle-loading cannon.

A second group are poisonous only in very high concentrations, but irritate the eyes when present in amounts so small that one part in five million may render a man blind with weeping in a few seconds. There is no evidence, so far as I know, that anyone was killed or even permanently blinded by these substances; but they had a great momentary effect. They can be kept out by respirators, or even goggles.

The third group of poisonous smokes, mostly arsenic compounds, were little developed during the war. They are,

CALLINICUS

however, weapons of very great efficiency, and it is well known that they would have been used by the British at any rate on a very extensive scale in 1919.* In small amounts, these smokes merely make one sneeze. In somewhat larger amounts they cause pain of the most terrific character in the head and chest. The pain in the head is described as like that caused when fresh water gets into the nose when bathing, but infinitely more severe. These symptoms are accompanied by the most appalling mental distress and misery. Some soldiers poisoned by these substances had to be prevented from committing suicide ; others temporarily went raving mad, and tried to burrow

* The American "Lewisite," of which so much was heard in 1918 and 1919, is a substance of this class.

CHEMICAL WARFARE

into the ground to escape from imaginary pursuers. And yet within forty-eight hours the large majority had recovered, and practically none became permanent invalids. These substances, when in the form of smoke, will penetrate any of the respirators used in the late War, though the British box-respirator would stop all but a little of them in the concentrations then used. In future they will probably be used in much larger concentrations and in finer particles than those formed by the German smoke-shells. It is extraordinarily difficult to produce a respirator which will completely stop very fine smoke, for the following reason : In a gas the molecules (or ultimate particles) are moving very rapidly, with speeds of several hundred yards per second, con-

CALLINICUS

tinually colliding and rebounding. A gas molecule, therefore, will probably hit the sides of a fairly narrow passage through which it is drawn. But a smoke particle is moving at a speed measured in inches per second, and is far less likely to hit the wall of the respirator, and be held by its absorbent surface. If we try to make the passages through which air is drawn very narrow, as by sucking in our air through cotton-wool (which will stop most smokes), we find that we have created an appalling resistance to breathing. There is an electrical method of removing smoke-particles completely, but it would probably more than double the weight of respirators, and does not appear to be either water-proof or fool-proof.

CHEMICAL WARFARE

The fourth group, of blistering gases, contains only one substance used during the War, dichlorethyl sulphide, or "mustard gas." This is really a liquid, whose vapour is not only poisonous when breathed, but blisters any part of the skin with which it comes into contact even. To take an example, a drop of the liquid was put on a piece of paper and left for five minutes on a man's sleeve. The vapour penetrated his coat and woollen shirt, causing a blister the effects of which lasted six weeks. And yet evaporation is so slow that ground contaminated by the liquid may remain dangerous for a week. Mustard gas caused more casualties to the British than all other chemical weapons put together.

Such are the weapons which chemistry

CALLINICUS

has given us. It is often asked why chemists cannot produce something which will put our foes comfortably to sleep and allow us to take them prisoners. The answer is that such substances exist, but that in small amounts they are harmless, in large amounts fatal. It is only over a moderate range of concentrations that their effect is merely stupefying. One has only to think of the familiar case of chloroform vapour, and the skill required to give neither too much nor too little.

It would be logical to speak of explosives under the heading of chemical warfare, but there is curiously little chance of explosives becoming any more effective. We know fairly well the maximum amount of energy which can

CHEMICAL WARFARE

possibly be got out of a chemical action, and, though explosives might perhaps be made which were about twice as destructive as our best (or worst) to-day, they would probably be far less stable, and therefore less safe to their users.

Of course, if we could utilize the forces which we now know to exist inside the atom, we should have such capacities for destruction that I do not know of any agency other than divine intervention which would save humanity from complete and peremptory annihilation. But the remoteness of the day when we shall use these forces may best be judged by an analogy. Some thousands of years ago someone first realized that the sun, moon and stars were not mere bodies as large as a plate or a house, but

CALLINICUS

very large, and moving very fast. It was an obvious idea that their motions might be exploited in some way. Wise men observed them and hoped, for example, to increase the probability of success in their own enterprises by beginning them when Jupiter was in the ascendant. These attempts were unsuccessful, though far more valuable to humanity than most of the methods successfully employed for the same purposes, such as fraud, violence and corruption. They led to astronomy, and so to all modern physics. We now know that the only probable way of harnessing the kinetic energy of the heavenly bodies is to employ tidal power to create electric currents. But five thousand years ago "hitching one's wagon to a star" was a reasonable

CHEMICAL WARFARE

project and not a poetic metaphor. The reason why we cannot do it is a simple matter of scale. And the reason why we cannot utilize subatomic phenomena is just the same. We cannot make apparatus small enough to disintegrate or fuse atomic nuclei, any more than we can make it large enough to reach to the moon. We can only bombard them with particles of which perhaps one in a million hit, which is like firing keys at a safe-door from a machine-gun a mile away in an attempt to open it. We do occasionally open it, but the process is very uneconomical. It may be asked why we cannot bring our machine-gun nearer, or improve our aim. To do this we should require to construct apparatus on the same infinitesimal scale as the structure of the

CALLINICUS

chemical atom. Now we can arrange atoms into various patterns. For example, we can arrange carbon, hydrogen and oxygen atoms in patterns which constitute the molecules of sugar, glycerine, or alcohol at will. This is called chemical synthesis. We have been doing it by rule-of-thumb methods for thousands of years, and are just beginning to learn a little about it. But even chemical molecules are much too large for our purposes. We can no more ask a chemist to build our apparatus than expect a theatrical scene-painter or a landscape-gardener to do us a miniature. We know very little about the structure of the atom and almost nothing about how to modify it. And the prospect of constructing such an apparatus seems to

CHEMICAL WELFARE

me to be so remote that, when some successor of mine is lecturing to a party spending a holiday on the moon, it will still be an unsolved (though not, I think, an ultimately insoluble) problem.

To see how chemical weapons are likely to be used in future we must study their employment in the late war. Lachrymatory gas was only once used under ideal conditions—by the Germans in the Argonne in 1915. They captured a fairly extensive French trench system and about 2,400 prisoners, almost all unwounded, but temporarily blind. When they gave the number of prisoners, the French authorities not unnaturally protested that this number was practically equal to the total of their casualties. And

CALLINICUS

this was quite true. The French were unprotected. They were deluged with shells giving off a vapour which temporarily blinded them. They could not even run away. The Germans walked across, removed their rifles, and formed them up in columns which marched back, each led by a German in goggles. In order to make future wars humane it would only be necessary to introduce the two following rules :—

1. No goggles or other eye protection shall be worn ;
2. No shells shall be used containing any other substance save ethyl iodo-acetate (or other lachrymatory compound) and a small bursting charge.

Certainly it is unlikely that such rules will ever be adopted, but I do contend

CHEMICAL WARFARE

that to forbid the use of such substances is a piece of sentimentalism as cruel as it is ridiculous.

Gases of the first group were used in clouds discharged from cylinders, sometimes on a front of several miles. They probably caused at least 20,000 casualties among unprotected or inadequately protected British troops. At least a quarter of these died, and that very painfully, in many cases after a struggle for breath lasting several days. On the other hand, those who did not die almost all recovered completely, and the symptoms of the few who became permanent invalids were mainly nervous. Apart, however, from the extreme terror and agitation produced by the gassing of uneducated people, I regard the type of wound produced by

CALLINICUS

the average shell as, on the whole, more distressing than the pneumonia caused by chlorine or phosgene. Besides being wounded, I have been buried alive, and on several occasions in peacetime I have been asphyxiated to the point of unconsciousness. The pain and discomfort arising from the other experiences were utterly negligible compared with those produced by a good septic shell-wound.

The first German cloud-gas attack was in April, 1915, the last in August, 1916, though the British continued them until the end of that year. They gradually became more and more ineffective as the efficiency of the respirators used on both sides increased. The first few German attacks were very well conducted, so far as the liberation

CHEMICAL WARFARE

of the gas was concerned, as they were arranged by Haber, an extremely competent chemist, who afterwards supervised their fixation of atmospheric nitrogen for the production of explosives. On the other hand, the German respirators were bad to begin with ; and later on were not so good as the British. This was, apparently, because the most competent physiologist in Germany with any knowledge of breathing was a Jew. This fact was quite well known in German physiological circles, but it would seem that his race prevented the military authorities from employing him. The result was that they were unable to follow up their gas-attacks at all closely, but had to wait till the cloud had passed off, by which time resistance was again possible. That was how the Germans paid for

CALLINICUS

anti-Semitism. It is very probable that it lost them the War, as never again, not even in March, 1918, had they as complete a gap in the Franco-British Western front as during the first gas-attack in April, 1915. It was, indeed, fortunate for the Germans that the Russians were still more anti-Semitic than themselves. Hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews volunteered for service in 1914. They were mostly refused, and in no case granted commissions. They then proceeded to turn their combative instincts into other channels, to the no small advantage of the Germans. If one goes to what is, perhaps, the opposite extreme from Russia, one finds the army of the world's most democratic nation, Australia, commanded by a Jew,

CHEMICAL WARFARE

Monash, and notes with interest that the Germans regarded the Australian troops as, on the whole, the most formidable, man for man, of all their opponents.

The other reason why the cloud-gas attacks were indecisive was that the Germans had relatively few reserves to put into the gap they made. Their reserves in April 1915 were in Poland. If they had trusted their scientific men they could certainly have captured Calais and Boulogne, and probably have annihilated the British Army.

In addition to clouds released from cylinders in the trenches, gas-cylinders were fired from trench-mortars, some hundreds at a time, into the enemy's lines, producing a sudden and dense cloud of gas before the men had time to

CALLINICUS

put on their respirators. But these bombardments, though they caused many casualties, were never decisive, as the cloud-attacks would have been, but for causes which we have discussed.

Mustard gas is a very different thing. It was never used to force a decision by breaking the enemy's lines, but to cause him casualties and deny him the use of ground. For, after a given area has been well sprayed with dichlorethyl sulphide from bursting shells for some time, it is death to occupy it without a mask, and the vapour may blister the skin, while anyone touching the ground will be certain of a very serious blister. Someone placed a drop of the liquid on the chair of the director of the British chemical warfare department. He ate his meals off the mantelpiece for a

CHEMICAL WARFARE

month. The most interesting thing, however, about mustard gas is that, though it caused 150,000 casualties in the British Army alone, less than 4,000 of these (or 1 in 40) died, while only about 700 (or 1 in every 200) became permanently unfit. Yet the Washington Conference has solemnly agreed that the signatory powers are not to use this substance against one another, though, of course, they will continue to use such humane weapons as bayonets, shells, and incendiary bombs.

It is worth while attempting to analyse the reasons for this rather curious decision. First, perhaps, we must put the complete and shameful ignorance of most of the politicians and many of the soldiers who took part in the Conference. Their ideas of gas warfare

CALLINICUS

were apparently drawn from descriptions of the great German cloud-gas attacks of 1915, which killed at least 1 in 4 of their casualties, and were written up on a large scale for recruiting and political purposes. But it is the business of politicians and soldiers, conceivably even of journalists, to know the truth about such matters before coming to decisions, or even impelling others to come to decisions about them.

To this ignorance, however, there was joined one of the most hideous forms of sentimentalism which has ever supported evil upon earth—the attachment of the professional soldier to cruel and obsolete killing machines. I would remind you of the conduct of the Chevalier Bayard, whom his contemporary soldiers described as *sans*

CHEMICAL WARFARE

peur et sans reproche. To captured knights, and even bowmen, he was the soul of courtesy, but musketeers or other users of gunpowder who fell into his hands were invariably put to death. It is worth remembering that, until the invention of gunpowder, fighting had for many centuries been remarkably safe for everyone who could afford a good suit of armour, while the abominable arquebus and its descendants have saved the remnants of Christendom from the Turks, Mongols, and other paynims who had by Bayard's time successfully overwhelmed one half of its original extent.

I remember an excellent example of Bayardism in the war. A Turkish airman had developed considerable flair for shooting down our observation

CALLINICUS

balloons. A British officer sent up one of these latter with a large cargo of gun-cotton, and blew up the Turk in question. For this deed he was severely reprimanded by the local officer commanding R.A.F. for unsportsmanlike conduct. This gentleman, doubtless, felt little objection to bombing, for example, Turkish transport columns, consisting mainly of non-combatants and animals, incapable of retaliating. (One may remark that between wounds and thirst perhaps 30,000 Turkish transport animals perished during our final victory in Palestine.) But he objected to airmen being killed except by other airmen. I, fighting in the mud beneath them, and exposed to the bombs of both sides (I was severely wounded by one of our

CHEMICAL WELFARE

own), felt differently. An attempt by the professional soldiers to stereotype the art of war into the channels which correspond to the ideas of 1914 might lead to a future rather different from that which I shall venture to predict, a future in which the military organizations of the world were overthrown by the exponents of some other mode of thinking, employing all the resources of science, and fighting "dirty." The opponents of the present world-order may, therefore, welcome Bayardism in their governments.

Meanwhile, the Bayardists have nobbled a curious assortment of allies in their so far successful attempt to prevent the humanization of warfare. First are a number of out-and-out pacifists, who object to all war, and

CALLINICUS

apparently hope to make it more difficult by restricting the means of fighting allowed. Some, of course, genuinely believe that gaseous weapons are more cruel than solid ones. Those who know the facts seem to me to be the victims of loose thinking. With them are associated a group of sentimentalists who appear to me definitely to be the Scribes and Pharisees of our age. These people, who are to be found in all political parties and most religious and irreligious sects, are generally willing (after a decent interval) to accept any application of science which appears to them profitable, or any social institution (such as war) which is hallowed by use and wont. They salve their consciences for such behaviour by attacking, in the name of their god or their

CHEMICAL WARFARE

ideals, every novelty, whether in thought or in action, which presents any loophole. In particular, they are distinguished by a ferocious opposition to, and contempt for, any attempt at the solution of human problems by honest and simple intellectual effort. Mustard gas kills one man for every forty it puts out of action ; shells kill one for every three ; but their god who compromised with high explosives has not yet found time to adapt himself to chemical warfare.

More respectable in every way are the candid reactionaries, like Lord Cecil, who believe in their hearts that, in abandoning traditional religion of the medieval type for scientific thought, man has definitely chosen the wrong path, and who fight with their eyes open

CALLINICUS

against its application. These people have a case, and are prepared to argue it. They would honestly desire to give up the gunpowder of Lazare Carnot for the sword of Bayard. But one cannot congratulate them on their associates.

And behind these follow like sheep the predestined victims of the next war, the peoples of the civilized nations who will undergo the extremity of suffering rather than think for themselves.

How profound and unreasoning the objection of the military mind to chemical warfare is can best be judged by one simple fact. About three years ago the British regular army gave up the instruction of every soldier in defence against hostile gas. For one thing, speed in adjusting respirators being of more importance than elegance,

CHEMICAL WARFARE

it did not form the basis of a satisfactory drill, like those curious relics of eighteenth-century musketry which still occupy so much of the time of our recruits. But the truth no doubt was that the officers did not like that sort of thing. The chemical and physiological ideas which underlie gas warfare require a certain effort to understand, and they do not arise in the study of a sport, as is the case with those underlying shooting and motor transport. One of the first acts of the late Labour Government was to reinstate some modicum of anti-gas instruction in the normal training of the Army. But it may be hoped that this pernicious and demoralizing teaching will once more be dropped with the return to power of one of the gentlemen's parties.

CALLINICUS

Personally, I must confess that I would go very much further than the Government, and seriously consider the provision of gas-masks for the population of London and other large towns, and the instruction of school-children in their use. If this is not done, there is at least the possibility of a disaster of the very first magnitude at an early stage in the next war. It is also one of the very few military measures which could hardly be regarded as provocative by the most ardent of foreign militarists or British pacifists. At the present moment, however, this need does not arise, as the French, who alone could bomb London, have very slight facilities for making mustard gas.

It is interesting to compare the attitude of our militarists to defence

CHEMICAL WARFARE

against gas with their attitude before the War to a possible German invasion. The fear of the latter, although the naval experts always stated that ~~it~~ was impossible on any serious scale, had been so impressed on the military mind by the propaganda of the National Service League and its like before the War that, from 1914 to 1918, hundreds of thousands of troops were quite unnecessarily kept in England. There is, however, this very fundamental difference between a defence against invasion and a defence against gas. The one would increase the importance of the professional soldier: the other would not. One does not need to be a very profound psychologist to see in this fact one reason why the military authorities dropped anti-gas training,

CALLINICUS

and why I, being a biochemist and therefore a person of the type who would become important if gas war returned, am advocating its extension. As to which of us is justified, I would suggest that it is more likely to-day that poisonous gas will be used against British soldiers or civilians in future wars than it was in 1912 that Britain would be invaded by the Germans.

We have seen that a case can be made out for gas as a weapon on humanitarian grounds, based on the very small proportion of killed to casualties from gas in the War, and especially during its last year. Against this may be urged the probability that future research will produce other gases or smokes which, as weapons, will be as cruel as, or more cruel than, the chlorine and phosgene

CHEMICAL WARFARE

used in 1915 and 1916. The answer to this is quite simple. First, as regards gases or vapours. Only a limited number of chemical substances are appreciably volatile, and of their vapours only a small proportion are poisonous. Now every chemical substance has a definite molecular weight. Those with a small molecular weight, *i.e.*, whose molecules are relatively light, are on the whole the most volatile, *i.e.*, go most easily into vapour. Now the large majority of the possible volatile chemical substances of small molecular weight, and therefore relatively simple chemical composition, are already known. Mustard gas, for example, was discovered and its properties described in 1886. There are probably substances of high molecular weight whose dense

CALLINICUS

vapours are even more poisonous than mustard gas. But the charcoal of our respirators has the property of absorbing heavy molecules of vapour quite independently of their chemical composition. It is, therefore, somewhat unlikely, though not, of course, impossible, that any very poisonous vapour will ever be found which will go through a mask impermeable to mustard gas or chlorine. It is, to my mind, far more probable that skin irritants may be discovered which are even more unpleasant than mustard gas.

The question of smokes is more serious. It was the hope of the producers of irritant smokes that they would penetrate the gas-masks in sufficient amounts to cause sneezing and force their victims to remove their

CHEMICAL WARFARE

masks, thus exposing themselves to greater concentrations of smoke and to poisonous vapours liberated along with the smoke. This was the German view when they introduced the " Blue Cross " shell in July, 1917. Fortunately, by that time our defence against gas and smoke was extremely good, and we had foreseen the smoke menace and introduced, between April and June, 1917, a filter which effectively stopped it in the concentrations then met in the field. It is not, however, at all unlikely that concentrations of smoke will be produced in the future which will penetrate our present masks. If our anti-gas measures are sufficiently neglected the consequences may, of course, be very serious.

It would seem likely that the chemical

CALLINICUS

weapons of the future will not be so very unlike those of the past. The main efforts of the soldier who uses them will be devoted, first, to blistering his enemy, secondly, to tiring him out by forcing him to wear a respirator continuously, which, of course, enormously hampers him for doing anything else.

In the Great War mustard gas and sensory irritant smokes were not used as the principal weapons of attack or defence, because the smokes would not incapacitate everyone in a given area, though they would make them keep their respirators on. Mustard gas, on the other hand, could make any area absolutely untenable by the defenders, but the vapour persisted for so many days that it could not be occupied by the attackers either. It was mainly used

CHEMICAL WARFARE

to produce casualties a few days or weeks before an attack on the units which would be defending, and to protect the flank of an offensive against counter-attack. Thus in April, 1918, Armentières, the original Northern limit of the German attack in Flanders, was so heavily shelled with "mustard" that the gutters in the streets were reported to be running with it. The Germans themselves received orders forbidding them to enter its ruins for a fortnight.

Nevertheless, mustard gas is so adequate a weapon that the attempt will almost certainly be made to use it not merely for making ground untenable for both sides, but for gaining it from the enemy. For this purpose the following methods suggest themselves. First,

CALLINICUS

attempts might be made to protect troops completely from the effect of gas on their skins by encasing them in air-tight overalls and gloves. These were used with a certain amount of success by machine-gunners in the Great War, but would hardly be practicable for attackers, who would, except perhaps in winter, die of heat-stroke if encased in such apparatus.

Air-tight tanks with adequate arrangements for filtering the incoming air are probably more hopeful, as mustard gas will not poison motors as it does men. (The motors would, of course, have their own air-supply, as it would hardly be practicable to filter air in the quantities needed by them.) To support the tanks and to tackle specially protected machine-gunners use will

CHEMICAL WARFARE

probably be made of immune infantry. One attack of gas-poisoning, whether by the lungs or skin, produces no immunity to a second attack—in fact, it generally increases the sensitivity of the victim. If a vapour is discovered against which immunity can be conferred, it will be the most effective weapon in history as long as its secret is kept. On the other hand, some people are naturally immune. The American Army authorities made a systematic examination of the susceptibility of large numbers of recruits. They found that there was a very resistant class, comprising 20% of the white men tried, but no less than 80% of the negroes. This is intelligible, as the symptoms of mustard gas blistering and sun-burn are very similar, and

CALLINICUS

negroes are pretty well immune to sunburn. It looks, therefore, as if, after a slight preliminary test, it should be possible to obtain coloured troops who would all be resistant to mustard gas blistering in concentrations harmful to most white men. Enough resistant whites are available to officer them.

One sees, then, the possibility of warfare on somewhat the following lines :--

Heavy concentrations of artillery would keep an area say thirty miles in length and ten in depth continuously sprayed with mustard gas. After allowing, say, two days for the development of blisters, the gassing of the positions within two or three miles of the front line is discontinued, but a long-range bombardment, especially of roads, goes on. Suddenly, behind the

CHEMICAL WARFARE

usual barrage of high explosive shells appears a line of tanks supported by negroes in gas-masks. They meet with but little opposition in the area still reeking of gas, and occupy the hostile lines to a depth of two or three miles. A counter-attack, even if successful, involves concentration in an area under gas-bombardment and enormous casualties from blistering. The only satisfactory counter-attack would be from the air. In this way the side possessing a big superiority of mustard gas should be in a position to advance two or three miles a day.

This kind of tactics was impossible during the Great War for a very simple reason. There was not enough mustard gas. The Germans used a quite surprisingly complicated process for its

CALLINICUS

manufacture. When we decided to follow their example, one of our chemists (a Cambridge man, I am glad to say) hit on a vastly cheaper and speedier method of manufacture. Unfortunately, our first supplies only arrived in the field in September, 1918. There is reason to think that the knowledge that we were at last about to develop gas and smoke warfare on a large scale had a good deal to do with the acceptance by the Germans of the armistice conditions.

The reason why we did not use mustard gas earlier is also simple and rather instructive.

In 1915 a British chemist proposed to a General who was concerned with such questions that the British should use dichlorethyl sulphide. "Does it

CHEMICAL WARFARE

kill?" asked the General. "No," he was told, "but it will disable enormous numbers of the enemy temporarily." "That is no good to us," said the man of blood; "we want something that will kill." It is interesting to find how completely the ideas of this worthy soldier as to the object of war coincided with those of the average intelligent child of five years old. I may remind you that Clausewitz held the view that the object of war was to impose one's will upon the enemy. This idea would, however, appear to have been too abstract, too complicated, or too humanitarian for the British military mind. At any rate, it had its fill of killing. It was not, therefore, until the Germans had demonstrated upon the persons of some tens of thousands of

CALLINICUS

British soldiers (we had 14,000 casualties, though with only 400 deaths, during the first three weeks of the mustard gas war) that there was something to be said for a weapon that was not primarily designed to kill, that we began to use it.

It seems, then, that mustard gas would enable an army to gain ground with far less killed on either side than the methods used in the late War, and would tend to establish a war of movement leading to a fairly rapid decision, as in the campaigns of the past. It would not much upset the present balance of power, Germany's chemical industry being counterpoised by French negro troops. Indians may be expected to be nearly as immune as negroes.

And clearly, the more war is compli-

CHEMICAL WARFARE

cated, the more unimportant become semi-civilized powers, such as Turkey and Russia, even as allies. The Turks were seldom capable of organizing a combined attack by any number greater than a battalion, or a shoot by anything larger than a battery. Yet small groups of them fought very well, and their individual guns made very good shooting. But gas-warfare demands organization, both of attack and defence—attack, because one tries to keep up a certain concentration of vapour over a whole large area rather than to knock out given groups of men; defence, because respirators and discipline in wearing them must be perfect. I need not say that in the Great War our military leaders strongly deprecated the use of gas against the Turks, on the

CALLINICUS

ground, I believe, that the latter were "gentlemen." They showed their gentlemanly character by such acts as the killing of 45% of the prisoners taken at Kut-el-Amara, not to mention some millions of Greeks and Armenians who had the misfortune to be Christians. But they never used gas: so perhaps they may have preserved their quality of gentlemen in the eyes of our Bayardists.

I claim, then, that the use of mustard gas in war on the largest possible scale would render it less expensive of life and property, shorter, and more dependent on brains rather than numbers. We are often told the exact opposite, that it will make it more barbarous and indecisive, and lead to the wiping out of the population of whole cities. Let us consider for a moment this latter alle-

CHEMICAL WARFARE

gation. Can aeroplanes do more against a hostile town with gas than with high explosive and incendiary bombs? We were threatened with gas bombs during the War, and certain London pharmacists made very large sums by the sale of alleged anti-gas masks. It could be, and was, urged at the time that as the carrying of these curious objects seemed to calm the civilian population in a moment of national emergency, they served a useful purpose. The same argument has been brought forward on behalf of amulets and other pious frauds sold in the name of religion. In the case of the above gas-masks, they inspired such faith (for they had a better finish than the official pattern and looked like one's idea of what a gas-mask ought to be) that some thousands were sent out

CALLINICUS

by fond relatives to soldiers at the front, a number of whom in consequence perished miserably.

Was there anything in the gas-bomb scare? In the first place, many otherwise well-informed people have very erroneous views as to the poisonousness of gases. Gases are dangerous in the laboratory or factory if they kill without giving warning by odour and irritation; but gases of this kind, such as carbon monoxide and hydrogen arsenide, have to be present, in order to kill, in concentrations which cannot practically be produced in the open. The insidiousness of hydrogen arsenide has, however, so alarmed chemists that a tradition persists of a man having been killed by a single bubble of it, while they are so afraid of smelling carbon monoxide

CHEMICAL WARFARE

that it is generally stated to be in-odorous. Besides errors due to this cause, there were errors of arithmetic. In one calculation which was made to show how easily London could be poisoned a decimal point went astray in one place! As the calculation was concerned with volumes of gas, the result came out as 10 metres cubed or 1,000 cubic metres, in place of one. For this reason it appeared that ten aeroplanes could do the damage which would actually have required ten thousand. However, most of the prophets of disaster from gas-bombs made no calculation at all. Let us try to make a rough one. On the nights of March 11th to March 14th, 1918, just before the great offensive of March 21st, the Germans fired 150,000 mustard gas

CALLINICUS

shells into the villages and valleys of the Cambrai salient, an area of about twenty square miles, the same as that of central London. This caused 4,500 casualties, of whom only fifty died (all of them because they took off their respirators too soon). The area was not evacuated. In central London, if the population had had gas-masks, the casualties would have been perhaps ten times greater. But we have to compare this hypothetical air-raid, not with any raid that actually occurred, but with a bombardment of 150,000 high-explosive shells or their equivalent in bombs. This would hardly have left a house in central London untouched, and the dead would have been numbered not in hundreds, but in tens of thousands. Such an attack would have required the

CHEMICAL WARFARE

visits on repeated nights of something like 1,000 aeroplanes. Such a number is not yet a practical possibility. We are, perhaps, inclined to under-estimate the potentialities of town-bombing with high explosive and incendiary bombs. In London, for example, there were never too many big fires started at any given time for the fire-brigades to deal with. An attack by ten or twenty times as many aeroplanes as ever bombed London simultaneously might well ring round a given area fairly completely with wrecked streets or burning houses, in which case most of the buildings and a good proportion of the inhabitants would perish. In one or two air-raids on other towns it seems probable that the Germans were not far from out-stripping the capacities of the

CALLINICUS

fire-brigades and producing very large conflagrations.

The reasons why explosives are more likely to be effective than poison on a town are as follows. Houses are far more vulnerable to explosives than earthworks, and do far more damage to their occupants in collapsing, besides being inflammable. And, on the other hand, they contain far more refuges which are nearly gas-proof. A shut room on a first or second floor would be nearly proof against gas released in the neighbourhood if it had not got a lighted fire to drag contaminated air from outside into it. Moreover, civilians could, and would, rapidly evacuate an area which had been heavily soaked with mustard gas, whereas soldiers have to stay on at the risk of their lives.

CHEMICAL WARFARE

Gas-bombs would certainly be far less effective than high-explosives on a town whose inhabitants were provided with respirators, probably even if they were unprovided. But, so long as London is undefended in this respect, it constitutes a standing temptation to any power desirous of making this kind of experiment. Judging from experience, there is no doubt that a gas or smoke attack from the air would occasion a first-class panic. The introduction of each new chemical weapon produced great terror, as did even such a militarily unimportant (though cruel) weapon as the *Flammenwerfer* (flame-projector). This was certainly due to ignorance. The French Colonial troops who were caught in the first cloud-gas attack were far more frightened than the Canadians,

CALLINICUS

and appear to have had far more casualties, although they mostly ran away : which the Canadians did not. For the Canadians made some attempts to improvise respirators, and almost any damp fabric will reduce the concentration of chlorine passing through it to half or less. They also breathed less because they did not run. As a matter of fact, a most efficient respirator against chlorine (though whether against mustard gas I do not know) can be made by knocking the bottom off a bottle, filling it with loose earth, placing its neck in the mouth, and breathing through it. Very great alarm was caused by the first mustard-gas bombardments in France, as no one had ever seen anything resembling the blisters it caused. But very soon

CHEMICAL WARFARE

familiarity bred contempt, or even liking, for aeroplanes dropped sheaves of pamphlets explaining how any soldier tired of the war could become a casualty without danger either of death or detection by allowing earth contaminated with mustard gas to touch the skin or the clothing. A good many wound-stripes were earned by this simple and up-to-date method, though, as we had the superiority in the air and the German soldiers were both more tired and more confiding than our own, the German casualties from this cause were probably still greater. But let us tell our civilian population before and not after they are attacked with blistering gases that the blisters produced are considerably less dangerous than measles. It was predicted during the

CALLINICUS

War that the survivors of lung-irritant gases would get consumption, while those burned by mustard gas would develop cancer. This has not happened, but it is the sort of rumour that easily starts.

For, after all, our greatest weapon in chemical warfare is not gas, but education, and education of all classes. By education I mean a process which puts people in general in touch with the thought of the abler minds of their own and past times, whether in literature or art, in science, mathematics, or music. An educated man knows enough of science, for example, to be able to distinguish a gas from a smoke, or a Grindell-Matthews from a Marconi, even if he is not thoroughly versed in the kinetic theory of gases or the laws

CHEMICAL WARFARE

governing radiation through the ether. Educated men are rather rare. It will be worth while giving some examples of how our uneducated politicians and soldiers failed to adjust themselves to the scientific thought of their contemporaries.

In April, 1915, a relatively educated member of the Government got hold of a physiologist, whose name I suppress as he is a modest man. He found a rather curious state of affairs. On the *Emden*, a German cruiser captured in the Indian Ocean, a German sailor had been found in possession of a pad of lint with tapes to tie in front of his mouth. It did not even cover his nose, and, though it might or might not have been of some value against smoke, it was of none at all against gas. There was,

CALLINICUS

however, a very prevalent belief at that time, and may be still, for all that I know, that German men of science were vastly superior to British. It is perfectly true that there are more of them, but I think that their average attainments in the last forty years have been, if anything, slightly below those of our own. So hypnotized, however, were some of the authorities in this country by this theory that it was being proposed to issue these articles to our troops. After pointing out their uselessness, the physiologist in question was rushed over to France in a destroyer, along with a chemist. He identified the gas used by the Germans as chlorine. On his return, he got a cylinder of that gas, let some into an air-tight chamber, and devised a rough respirator which would

CHEMICAL WARFARE

keep most of it out, trying various possible methods on himself. On his return to the War Office, rather short of breath from the chlorine he had breathed, he found to his horror that the appeal to the women of England for home-made respirators had been issued. Their design was apparently based on the captured German one, which had very probably been made on the *Emden*. As they were quite useless, he secured a promise that they would not be sent out to France. Things were not made easier by the opinion held in high military quarters that, offence being more important than defence, the great thing was to reply to the Germans by gassing them. As, however, this could not be done in less than five months, while respirators

CALLINICUS

could easily be made in a week; it led to delay at a somewhat vital moment. Finally every important decision taken in England had to pass through the hands of Lord Kitchener, who naturally had not time to weigh the arguments at all fully. It is not my intention to attack Lord Kitchener: that the war could be carried on at all under such a system proves that he was a great man. But, if he had managed to delegate some of his powers, he would have proved himself a greater. As the result of all this delay, a great many of the first respirators had to be made in France.

Convalescent soldiers and the nuns in a convent on the Mont des Cats were conscripted to make respirators, which, if inelegant, were fairly efficient. Un-

CHEMICAL WARFARE

fortunately, consignments of "Women of England" and other home-made respirators were continually appearing in France, and every now and then led to a battalion or so being wiped out. I am able to give these details, because at this time I, who before and after was an honest infantry bombing-officer, made my brief incursion into chemical warfare. I arrived at St Omer from my comfortable trench as being a person accustomed to poisonous gases in civil life. In a large school there, converted into a hospital, there was a small glass-fronted room, like a miniature greenhouse, into which known volumes of chlorine were liberated. We had to compare the effects on ourselves of various quantities with and without respirators. It stung the eyes and

CALLINICUS

produced a tendency to gasp and cough when breathed. For this reason trained physiologists had to be employed. An ordinary soldier would probably restrain his tendency to gasp, cough, and throw himself about if he were working a machine-gun in a battle, but could not do so in a laboratory experiment with nothing to take his mind off his own feelings. An experienced physiologist has more self-control. It was also necessary to see if one could run or work hard in the respirators, so we had a wheel of some kind to turn by hand in the gas chamber, not to mention doing fifty-yard sprints in respirators outside. As each of us got sufficiently affected by gas to render his lungs unduly irritable, another would take his place. None of us was much the

CHEMICAL WARFARE

worse for the gas, or in any real danger, as we knew where to stop, but some had to go to bed for a few days, and I was very short of breath and incapable of running for a month or so. This work, which was mainly done by civilians, was rewarded by the grant of the Military Cross to the brilliant young officer who used to open the door of the motor-car of the medical General who occasionally visited the experiments. The soldiers who took part in them could, however, for some time be distinguished by the peculiar green colour of their brass buttons due to the action of the gas.

Even when arrangements had been made for the manufacture of respirators in England, the supply suddenly dried up. It was found that the girls who

CALLINICUS

made them were working as best they could with raw and bleeding fingers, and London was being scoured for rubber gloves. Someone had altered the formula of the mixture in which the respirators were dipped by substituting for carbonate of soda caustic soda, which has the property of dissolving the human skin. His name, needless to say, does not appear in the official history.

Such were some of the difficulties which we incurred in our anti-gas work, through the ignorance of highly-placed persons. As, however, our defensive (though not our offensive) measures were ultimately better than those of any other nation, things must have been still worse elsewhere. The success of our respirators was largely due to one man,

CHEMICAL WARFARE

Harrison, whose name is insufficiently known to his countrymen. He was an analytical chemist, and author of that admirable and too little read work *Secret Remedies* (published by the British Medical Association). He enlisted as a private, but was a Lieutenant-Colonel when he died of influenza and overwork in 1918.

Naturally the ignorance of our private soldiers was of an even more abysmal character. In the early days they often removed the respirators from their faces and tied them round their chests, as it was there that they felt the effects of the gas. Again in 1917 80% of the mustard-gas cases vomited, while this symptom was rare in 1918. Apparently it took five months for the British Army to realize that gas-poisoning did

CALLINICUS

not necessarily mean poisoning through the stomach.

If, then, in future wars we are to avoid gross mismanagement in high places, and panic and stupidity among the masses, it is essential that everyone should learn a little elementary science, that politicians and soldiers should not be proud of their ignorance of it, that ordinary men and women should not be ashamed or afraid of knowing something of the working of their own bodies. If we persist in the belief that we can be saved by patriotism or social reforms, or by military preparation of the type which would have sufficed in former struggles, we shall go down before some nation of more realistic views. We do not know what type of scientific knowledge will be needed : we can be

CHEMICAL WARFARE

certain that some type will be. The British are a tired people: they like to rest "in breathless quiet after all their ills," and to pin their faith to the promises of leaders whose eyes are fixed on the past. It has all happened before.

· "Ganz vergessener Völker Müdig-
keiten

Kann ich nicht abthun von
meinen Lidern,

Noch weghalten von der er-
schrockenen Seele

Stummes Niederfallen ferner
Sterne."

("I cannot lift from my eyelids the weariness of quite forgotten peoples, nor hold away from my terrified soul the dumb downfall of far stars.")

The Roman and Spanish Empires appear to have perished largely from

CALLINICUS

intellectual torpor. Are we to go the same way?

We have got to get over our distaste for scientific thought and scientific method. To take an example from the War, the physiologists at the experimental ground at Porton, in Hampshire, had considerable difficulty in working with a good many soldiers because the latter objected so strongly to experiments on animals, and did not conceal their contempt for people who performed them. And yet these soldiers would have had no hesitation in shelling the horses of hostile gun-teams, and the vast majority of them were in the habit of shooting animals for sport. I have never known a physiologist who went in for shooting animals: physiologists know too much of the processes which

CHEMICAL WARFARE

occur in a wounded beast or bird that creeps away to die. And, though I have seen a good many scientific experiments on animals, I have never seen one which, so far as concerns the pain given, I should object to having performed on myself. That this attitude is not unusual would appear from the following experiment described by the principal physiologist employed at the Porton experimental ground, in which he wished to compare the effects of hydrocyanic (or prussic) acid gas on himself and a dog. They both entered a chamber containing 1 part in 2,000 of the gas.

“ In order (he writes) that the experiment might be as fair as possible and that my respiration should be relatively as active as that of the dog, I remained standing, and took a few steps from time

CALLINICUS

to time while I was in the chamber. In about thirty seconds the dog began to get unsteady, and in fifty-five seconds it dropped on the floor and commenced the characteristic distressing respiration which heralds death from cyanide poisoning. One minute thirty-five seconds after the commencement the animal's body was carried out, respiration having ceased and the dog being apparently dead. I then left the chamber. As regards the result upon myself, the only real effect was a momentary giddiness when I turned my head quickly. This lasted about a year, and then vanished. For some time it was difficult to concentrate on anything for any length of time. It is hard to say to what extent this was due to the experiment."

CHEMICAL WARFARE

As the result of this work, hydrocyanic acid was given up for use in the field, as phosgene is effective at fifty times this dilution, and mustard gas at one thousand times.

One of the grounds given for objection to science is that science is responsible for such horrors as those of the late War. "You scientific men (we are told) never think of the possible application of your discoveries. You do not mind whether they are used to kill or to cure. Your method of thinking, doubtless satisfactory when dealing with molecules and atoms, renders you insensible to the difference between right and wrong. And so you devise the means of universal destruction, and sell them into the hands of unrighteous and bloody-minded men."

CALLINICUS

I note that the people who make these remarks do not refuse to travel by railway or motor-car, to use electric light, or to read mechanically printed newspapers. Nor do they install a well in their back-gardens to enjoy drinking the richer water of a pre-scientific age, with its interesting and variegated fauna. But it is quite easy to show that the destructive and horrible nature of modern warfare is due, not to the weapons used, but largely to the other applications of science which constitute the material basis of our civilization. Let us imagine the Great War fought with all our means of transport and preventive medicine, but no weapons more complicated than swords, spears, and possibly a few bows. With fewer munitions the armies could have been

CHEMICAL WARFARE

mobilized even more rapidly, and more men put in the fighting line. The Germans would probably have tried, as they tried in 1914, to bring about a "Schlacht ohne Morgen," a battle on reversed fronts modelled on Cannae. The fighting would probably have been about as severe as at Cannae, and men would have been fighting in close order, ten or twenty deep, along a hundred-mile front. No doubt it would have been over sooner, but the losses would probably have been just as great. The French and Germans would doubtless both have gone on fighting until at least half their armies had become casualties, and, with four years' fighting compressed into as many weeks, it would have been impossible to tend more than a fraction of the wounded. The chief difference

CALLINICUS

might have been that the Russians would have been victorious by mere weight of numbers, and the French defeated. In former wars slaughter was limited by the fact that large armies could not be fed, and developed epidemic diseases. They also moved very slowly. So it took twenty-three years (from 1792 to 1815) to wear down the resistance of the French nation. Moreover, the Great War was the first since the Second Punic War of the 3rd century B.C. between two great civilized nations, each fighting with all its might. This fact accounts for its ferocity. Modern transport and hygiene made its scale possible ; the weapons used merely served to prolong it.

The objection to scientific weapons such as the gases of the late War, and

CHEMICAL WARFARE

such new devices as may be employed in the next, is essentially an objection to the unknown. Fighting with lances or guns, one can calculate, or thinks one can calculate, one's chances. But with gas or rays or microbes one has an altogether different state of affairs. Poisonous gas had a great moral effect, just because it was new and incomprehensible. As long as we permit ourselves to be afraid of the novel and unknown, there will be a very great temptation to use novel and unknown weapons against us. Now, terror of the unknown is thoroughly right and rational so long as we believe that the prince of this world is a malignant being. But it is not justifiable if we believe that the world is the expression of a power friendly to our aspirations, or if

CALLINICUS

we are atheists and hold that it is neutral and indifferent to human ideals.

It will by now have become clear to you that I am writing somewhat parabolically. What I have said about mustard gas might be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to most other applications of science to human life. They can all, I think, be abused, but none perhaps is always evil ; and many, like mustard gas, when we have got over our first not very rational objection to them, turn out to be, on the whole, good. If it is right for me to fight my enemy with a sword, it is right for me to fight him with mustard gas : if the one is wrong, so is the other. But I have no sympathy whatever for Mr Facing-both-ways when he says that, though he is prepared on

CHEMICAL WARFARE

occasion to fight, he will not use these nasty new-fangled weapons. Of course I am not suggesting that we should violate or prepare to violate the Washington Agreement on this subject. I do, however, believe that we ought to denounce it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Such are the facts about chemical warfare. They will not be believed because a belief in them would do violence to the sentiments of most people. They will not be promulgated, as there is no money to be made out of them. (Chemical manufacturers make both high explosives and mustard gas, and the former more easily.) The views which I have expressed do not coexist in the mind of any party leader or newspaper proprietor, and must there-

CALLINICUS

fore be those of a crank. But until some stronger argument can be waged against them than that they are unusual and unpleasant, there remains the possibility that ~~they are~~ true.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Each, fott 8vo, boards, 2/6 net

THIS series of books, by some of the most distinguished English thinkers, scientists, philosophers, doctors, critics, and artists, was at once recognized as a noteworthy event. Written from various points of view, one book frequently opposing the argument of another, they provide the reader with a stimulating survey of the most modern thought in many departments of life. Several volumes are devoted to the future trend of Civilization, conceived as a whole; while others deal with particular provinces. It is interesting to see in these neat little volumes, issued at a low price, the revival of a form of literature, the Pamphlet, which has been in disuse for many years.

Published by

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.
Broadway House: 68-74 Carter Lane, London, E.C.4.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

FROM THE REVIEWS

Times Literary Supplement: "An entertaining series."

Spectator: "Scintillating monographs."

Observer: "There seems no reason why the brilliant To-day and To-morrow Series should come to an end for a century of to-morrows. At first it seemed impossible for the publishers to keep up the sport through a dozen volumes, but the series already runs to more than two score. A remarkable series . . ."

Nation: "We are able to peer into the future by means of that brilliant series [which] will constitute a precious document upon the present time."—T. S. ELIOT.

Manchester Dispatch: "The more one reads of these pamphlets, the more avid becomes the appetite. We hope the list is endless."

Irish Statesman: "Full of lively controversy."

Daily Herald: "This series has given us many monographs of brilliance and discernment. . . . The stylistic excellences of this provocative series."

Field: "We have long desired to express the deep admiration felt by every thinking scholar and worker at the present day for this series. We must pay tribute to the high standard of thought and expression they maintain. As small gift-books, austere yet prettily produced, they remain unequalled of their kind. We can give but the briefest suggestions of their value to the student, the politician, and the voter. . . ."

Japan Chronicle: "While cheap prophecy is a futile thing, wisdom consists largely in looking forward to consequences. It is this that makes these books of considerable interest."

New York World: "Hold the palm in the speculative and interpretative thought of the age."

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

VOLUMES READY

Daedalus, or Science and the Future.
By J. B. S. HALDANE, Reader in
Biochemistry, University of Cambridge.
Seventh impression.

"A fascinating and daring little book."
—*Westminster Gazette*. "The essay is brilliant,
sparkling with wit and bristling with
challenges."—*British Medical Journal*.

"Predicts the most startling changes."
—*Morning Post*.

Callinicus, a Defence of Chemical Warfare. By J. B. S. HALDANE. *Second impression.*

"Mr. Haldane's brilliant study."—*Times Leading Article*. "A book to be read by every intelligent adult."—*Spectator*. "This brilliant little monograph."—*Daily News*.

Icarus, or the Future of Science. By
BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. *Fourth impression.*

"Utter pessimism."—*Observer*. "Mr. Russell refuses to believe that the progress of Science must be a boon to mankind."—*Morning Post*. "A stimulating book, that leaves one not at all discouraged."—*Daily Herald*.

What I Believe. By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. *Third impression.*

"One of the most brilliant and thought-stimulating little books I have read—a better book even than *Icarus*."—*Nation*. "Simply and brilliantly written."—*Nature*. "In stabbing sentences he punctures the bubble of cruelty, envy, narrowness, and ill-will which those in authority call their morals."—*New Leader*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Tantalus, or the Future of Man. By F. C. S. SCHILLER, D.Sc., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. *Second impression.*

"They are all (*Daedalus, Icarus, and Tantalus*) brilliantly clever, and they supplement or correct one another."—*Dean Inge, in Morning Post.* "Immensely valuable and infinitely readable."—*Daily News.* "The book of the week."—*Spectator.*

Cassandra, or the Future of the British Empire. By F. C. S. SCHILLER, D.Sc.

"We commend it to the complacent of all parties."—*Saturday Review.* "The book is small, but very, very weighty; brilliantly written, it ought to be read by all shades of politicians and students of politics."—*Yorkshire Post.* "Yet another addition to that bright constellation of pamphlets."—*Spectator.*

Quo Vadimus? Glimpses of the Future. By E. E. FOURNIER D'ALBE, D.Sc., author of "Selenium, the Moon Element," etc.

"A wonderful vision of the future. A book that will be talked about."—*Daily Graphic.* "A remarkable contribution to a remarkable series."—*Manchester Dispatch.* "Interesting and singularly plausible."—*Daily Telegraph.*

Thrasymachus, the Future of Morals. By C. E. M. JOAD, author of "The Babbitt Warren," etc. *Second impression.*

"His provocative book."—*Graphic.* "Written in a style of deliberate brilliance."—*Times Literary Supplement.* "As outspoken and unequivocal a contribution as could well be imagined. Even those readers who dissent will be forced to recognize the admirable clarity with which he states his case. A book that will startle."—*Daily Chronicle.*

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Lysistrata, or Woman's Future and Future Woman. By ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI, author of "A Defence of Aristocracy," etc. *Second Impression.*

"A stimulating book. Volumes would be needed to deal, in the fullness his work provokes, with all the problems raised."—*Sunday Times*. "Pro-feminine, but anti-feministic." *Scotsman*. "Full of brilliant common-sense."—*Observer*.

Hypatia, or Woman and Knowledge. By MRS BERTRAND RUSSELL. With a frontispiece. *Third impression.*

An answer to *Lysistrata*. "A passionate vindication of the rights of women."—*Manchester Guardian*. "Says a number of things that sensible women have been wanting publicly said for a long time."—*Daily Herald*.

Hephaestus, the Soul of the Machine. By E. E. FOURNIER D'ALBE, D.Sc.

"A worthy contribution to this interesting series. A delightful and thought-provoking essay."—*Birmingham Post*. "There is a special pleasure in meeting with a book like *Hephaestus*. The author has the merit of really understanding what he is talking about."—*Engineering*. "An exceedingly clever defence of machinery."—*Architects' Journal*.

The Passing of the Phantoms : a Study of Evolutionary Psychology and Morals. By C. J. PATTEN, Professor of Anatomy, Sheffield University. With 4 Plates.

"Readers of *Daedalus*, *Icarus* and *Tantalus*, will be grateful for an excellent presentation of yet another point of view."—*Yorkshire Post*. "This bright and bracing little book." *Literary Guide*. "Interesting and original."—*Medical Times*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

The Mongol in our Midst: a Study of Man and his Three Faces. By F. G. CROOKSHANK, M.D., F.R.C.P. With 28 Plates. *Second Edition, revised.*

"A brilliant piece of speculative induction."
—*Saturday Review*. "An extremely interesting and suggestive book, which will reward careful reading."—*Sunday Times*. "The pictures carry fearful conviction."—*Daily Herald*.

The Conquest of Cancer. By H. W. S. WRIGHT, M.S., F.R.C.S. Introduction by F. G. CROOKSHANK, M.D.

"Eminently suitable for general reading. The problem is fairly and lucidly presented. One merit of Mr Wright's plan is that he tells people what, in his judgment, they can best do, *here and now*."—From the *Introduction*.

Pygmalion, or the Doctor of the Future.
By R. McNAIR WILSON, M.B.

"Dr Wilson has added a brilliant essay to this series."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "This is a very little book, but there is much wisdom in it."—*Evening Standard*. "No doctor worth his salt would venture to say that Dr Wilson was wrong."—*Daily Herald*.

Prometheus, or Biology and the Advancement of Man. By H. S. JENNINGS, Professor of Zoology, Johns Hopkins University.

"This volume is one of the most remarkable that has yet appeared in this series. Certainly the information it contains will be new to most educated laymen. It is essentially a discussion of . . . heredity and environment, and it clearly establishes the fact that the current use of these terms has no scientific justification."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "An exceedingly brilliant book."—*New Leader*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Narcissus: an Anatomy of Clothes. By GERALD HEARD. With 19 illustrations.

"A most suggestive book."—*Nation*
"Irresistible. Reading it is like a switchback journey. Starting from prehistoric times we rocket down the ages."—*Daily News*.
"Interesting, provocative, and entertaining."—*Queen*.

Thamyris, or Is There a Future for Poetry? By R. C. TREVELYAN.

"Learned, sensible, and very well-written."—*Affable Hawk*, in *New Statesman*. "Very suggestive."—*J. C. Squire*, in *Observer*.
"A very charming piece of work, I agree with all, or at any rate, almost all its conclusions."—*J. St. Loe Strachey*, in *Spectator*.

Proteus, or the Future of Intelligence. By VERNON LEE, author of "Satan the Waster," etc.

"We should like to follow the author's suggestions as to the effect of intelligence on the future of Ethics, Aesthetics, and Manners. Her book is profoundly stimulating and should be read by everyone."—*Outlook*. "A concise, suggestive piece of work."—*Saturday Review*.

Timotheus, the Future of the Theatre. By BONAMY DOBRÉE, author of "Restoration Drama," etc.

"A witty, mischievous little book, to be read with delight."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "This is a delightfully witty book."—*Scotsman*. "In a subtly satirical vein he visualizes various kinds of theatres in 200 years time. His gay little book makes delightful reading."—*Nation*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Paris, or the Future of War. By Captain B. H. LIDDELL HART.

"A companion volume to *Callinicus*. A gem of close thinking and deduction."—*Observer*. "A noteworthy contribution to a problem of concern to every citizen in this country."—*Daily Chronicle*. "There is some lively thinking about the future of war in *Paris*, just added to this set of live-wire pamphlets on big subjects."—*Manchester Guardian*.

Wireless Possibilities. By Professor A. M. Low. With 4 diagrams.

"As might be expected from an inventor who is always so fresh, he has many interesting things to say."—*Evening Standard*. "The mantle of Blake has fallen upon the physicists. To them we look for visions, and we find them in this book."—*New Statesman*.

Perseus : of Dragons. By H. F. SCOTT STOKES. With 2 illustrations.

"A diverting little book, chock-full of ideas. Mr Stokes' dragon-lore is both quaint and various."—*Morning Post*. "Very amusingly written, and a mine of curious knowledge for which the discerning reader will find many uses."—*Glasgow Herald*.

Lycurgus, or the Future of Law. By E. S. P. HAYNES, author of "Concerning Solicitors," etc.

"An interesting and concisely written book."—*Yorkshire Post*. "He roundly declares that English criminal law is a blend of barbaric violence, medieval prejudices, and modern fallacies. . . . A humane and conscientious investigation."—*T.P.'s Weekly*. "A thoughtful book—deserves careful reading."—*Law Times*.

TC DAY AND TO-MORROW

Euterpe, or the Future of Art. By LIONEL R. MCCOLVIN, author of "The Theory of Book-Selection."

"Discusses briefly, but very suggestively, the problem of the future of art in relation to the public."—*Saturday Review*. "Another indictment of machinery as a soul-destroyer . . . Mr Colvin has the courage to suggest solutions."—*Westminster Gazette*. "This is altogether a much-needed book."—*New Leader*.

Pegasus, or Problems of Transport. By Colonel J. F. C. FULLER, author of "The Reformation of War," etc. With 8 Plates.

"The foremost military prophet of the day propounds a solution for industrial and unemployment problems. It is a bold essay . . . and calls for the attention of all concerned with imperial problems."—*Daily Telegraph*. "Practical, timely, very interesting and very important."—J. St. Loe Strachey, in *Spectator*.

Atlantis, or America and the Future. By Colonel J. F. C. FULLER.

"Candid and caustic."—*Observer*. "Many hard things have been said about America, but few quite so bitter and caustic as these."—*Daily Sketch*. "He can conjure up possibilities of a new Atlantis."—*Clarion*.

Midas, or the United States and the Future. By C. H. BRETHERTON, author of "The Real Ireland", etc.

A companion volume to *Atlantis*. "Full of astute observations and acute reflections . . . this wise and witty pamphlet, a provocation to the thought that is creative."—*Morning Post*. "A punch in every paragraph. One could hardly ask for more meat."—*Spectator*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Nuntius, or Advertising and its Future.

By GILBERT RUSSELL.

"Expresses the philosophy of advertising concisely and well."—*Observer*. "It is doubtful if a more straightforward exposition of the part advertising plays in our public and private life has been written."—*Manchester Guardian*.

Birth Control and the State: a Plea and a Forecast. By C. P. BLACKER, M.C., M.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

"A very careful summary."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "A temperate and scholarly survey of the arguments for and against the encouragement of the practice of birth control."—*Lancet*. "He writes lucidly, moderately, and from wide knowledge; his book undoubtedly gives a better understanding of the subject than any other brief account we know. It also suggests a policy."—*Saturday Review*.

Ouroboros, or the Mechanical Extension of Mankind. By GARET GARRETT.

"This brilliant and provoking little book."—*Observer*. "A significant and thoughtful essay, calculated in parts to make our flesh creep."—*Spectator*. "A brilliant writer, Mr. Garrett is a remarkable man. He explains something of the enormous change the machine has made in life."—*Daily Express*.

Artifex, or the Future of Craftsmanship.

By JOHN GLOAG, author of "Time, Taste, and Furniture."

"An able and interesting summary of the history of craftsmanship in the past, a direct criticism of the present, and at the end his hopes for the future. Mr Gloag's real contribution to the future of craftsmanship is his discussion of the uses of machinery."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Plato's American Republic. By J. DOUGLAS WOODRUFF. *Third impression.*

"Uses the form of the Socratic dialogue with devastating success. A gently malicious wit sparkles in every page."—*Sunday Times*.
"Having deliberately set himself an almost impossible task, has succeeded beyond belief."—*Saturday Review*. "Quite the liveliest even of this spirited series."—*Observer*.

Orpheus, or the Music of the Future. By W. J. TURNER, author of "Music and Life."

"A book on music that we can read not merely once, but twice or thrice. Mr Turner has given us some of the finest thinking upon Beethoven that I have ever met with."—*Ernest Newman* in *Sunday Times*. "A brilliant essay in contemporary philosophy."—*Outlook*. "The fruit of real knowledge and understanding."—*New Statesman*.

Terpander, or Music and the Future. By E. J. DENT, author of "Mozart's Operas."

"In *Orpheus* Mr Turner made a brilliant voyage in search of first principles. Mr Dent's book is a skilful review of the development of music. It is the most succinct and stimulating essay on music I have found. . . ."—*Musical News*. "Remarkably able and stimulating."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "There is hardly another critic alive who could sum up contemporary tendencies so neatly."—*Spectator*.

Sibylla, or the Revival of Prophecy. By C. A. MACE, University of St. Andrew's.

"An entertaining and instructive pamphlet."—*Morning Post*. "Places a nightmare before us very ably and wittily."—*Spectator*. "Passages in it are excellent satire, but on the whole Mr Mace's speculations may be taken as a trustworthy guide . . . to modern scientific thought."—*Birmingham Post*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW,

Lucullus, or the Food of the Future. By OLGA HARTLEY and MRS C. F. LEYEL, authors of 'The Gentle Art of Cookery.'

"This is a clever and witty little volume in an entertaining series, and it makes enchanting reading."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "Opens with a brilliant picture of modern man, living in a vacuum-cleaned, steam-heated, credit-furnished suburban mansion 'with a wolf in the basement'—the wolf of hunger. This banquet of epigrams."—*Spectator*.

Procrustes, or the Future of English Education. By M. ALDERTON PINK.

"Undoubtedly he makes out a very good case."—*Daily Herald*. "This interesting addition to the series."—*Times Educational Supplement*. "Intends to be challenging and succeeds in being so. All fit readers will find it stimulating."—*Northern Echo*.

The Future of Futurism. By JOHN RODKER.

"Mr. Rodker is up-to-the-minute, and he has accomplished a considerable feat in writing, on such a vague subject, 92 extremely interesting pages."—T. S. Eliot, in *Nation*. "There are a good many things in this book which are of interest."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

Pomona, or the Future of English. By BASIL DE SÉLINCOURT, author of 'The English Secret', etc.

"The future of English is discussed fully and with fascinating interest."—*Morning Post*. "Has a refreshing air of the unexpected. Full of wise thoughts and happy words."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "Here is suggestive thought, quite different from most speculations on the destiny of our language."—*Journal of Education*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Balbus, or the Future of Architecture.
By CHRISTIAN BARMAN, editor of 'The Architect's Journal'.

"A really brilliant addition to this already distinguished series. The reading of *Balbus* will give much data for intelligent prophecy, and incidentally, an hour or so of excellent entertainment."—*Spectator*. "Most readable and reasonable. We can recommend it warmly."—*New Statesman*. "This intriguing little book."—*Connoisseur*.

JUST PUBLISHED

Apella, or the Future of the Jews. By
A QUARTERLY REVIEWER.

"Cogent, because of brevity and a magnificent prose style, this book wins our quiet praise. It is a fine pamphlet, adding to the value of the series, and should not be missed."—*Spectator*. "A notable addition to this excellent series. His arguments are a provocation to fruitful thinking."—*Morning Post*.

The Dance of Çiva, or Life's Unity and Rhythm. By COLLUM.

"It has substance and thought in it. The author is very much alive and responsive to the movements of to-day which seek to unite the best thought of East and West, and discusses Mussolini and Jagadis Bose with perspicacity."—*Spectator*.

Lars Porsena, or the Future of Swearing and Improper Language. By ROBERT GRAVES.

"An amusing little book."—*Daily Mirror*. "It is to this subject [of swearing] that Mr. Graves brings much erudition and not a little irony."—*John O'London's Weekly*. "Not for squeamish readers."—*Spectator*. "Too outspoken. The writer sails very near the wind, but all the same has some sound constructive things to say."—*Manchester Dispatch*.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Socrates, or the Emancipation of Mankind. By H. F. CARLILL.

Sets out the new view of the nature of man, to which the trend of modern psychology, anthropology, and evolutionary theory has led, shows the important consequences to human behaviour and efficiency which are bound to follow, and maintains that man is at last conscious of his power to control his biological inheritance.

Delphos, or the Future of International Language. By E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

An inquiry into the possibility of a medium of inter-communication, auxiliary to the mother tongues. A survey of past attempts from the sixteenth century to the present day. A prophecy of the coming inter-language, its form, its social and cultural utility, and its influence on world peace.

Gallo, or the Tyranny of Science. By J. W. N. SULLIVAN, author of "A History of Mathematics."

Is the scientific universe the real universe? What is the character of the universe revealed by modern science? Are values inherent in reality? What is the function of the arts? In addition to answering these questions, the author attacks the notion that science is materialistic.

Apollonius, or the Future of Psychical Research. By E. N. BENNETT, author of "Problems of Village Life," etc.

An attempt to summarize the results secured by the scientific treatment of psychical phenomena, to forecast the future developments of such research, and to answer the familiar question "What is the good of it all?"

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

NEARLY READY

Janus, or the Conquest of War. By WILLIAM McDUGALL, M.B., F.R.S., Professor of Psychology, Harvard University, author of "The Group Mind," etc.

A volume of fundamental importance to all those who would avoid future wars. Sections are devoted to lessons of the Great War, the Causes of War, Preventives of War, League to Enforce Peace, and International Air Force as a Prevention of War.

Rusticus, or the Future of the Countryside. By MARTIN S. BRIGGS, F.R.I.B.A., author of "A Short History of the Building Crafts," etc.

Attributes much of the blame for the desecration of our countryside to the petrol engine, though he recognizes other contributory causes. He attempts to analyse the charm of our counties before the Industrial Revolution and shows how that movement influenced their aspect. Finally he surveys the future, making practical suggestions to avoid further 'uglification.'

Aeolus, or the Future of the Flying Machine. By OLIVER STEWART, author of "Strategy and Tactics of Air Fighting."

A picture of the air-vehicle and air-battle-ship of the future, painted with colours from the aeronautical research work of to-day. The author foresees that the flying machine will resist mass production. Aircraft will be exalted as individual creations of the Artist-Scientist rather than debased as tools of the Commercialist.

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Stentor, or the Future of the Press. By
DAVID OCKHAM.

Shows how since the War the control of the Press has passed into the hands of only five men. The law is powerless, even if willing, to check this justification. Now that independent organs of opinion are almost eliminated, the author discusses the danger to the community unless the Public is made aware of the personalities and policies behind the Trusts.

IN PREPARATION

The Future of India. By T. EARLE
WELBY.

An analysis of the spiritual and political future of 320 million persons in the light of present tendencies.

Mercurius, or the World on Wings.
By C. THOMPSON WALKER.

A picture of the air-vehicle and the air-port of to-morrow, and the influence aircraft will have on our lives.

The Future of Films. By ERNEST
BETTS.

Vulcan, or Labour To-Day and To-Morrow. By CECIL CHISHOLM.

